

NOW READY.

THE CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1875.

THIS Work, in the THIRTEENTH year of its existence, is

NOW READY FOR SALE. It has been compiled and printed at the Daily Press Office, as usual, from the best and most authentic sources, and no pains have been spared to make the work complete in all respects.

In addition to the usual varied and voluminous information, the value of the "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1875" has been further augmented by a

CHROMO-LITHOGRAPH

OF

PLAN OF VICTORIA, HONGKONG.

THE FOREIGN SETTLEMENTS OF

SHANGHAI.

A Chromo-Lithograph Plate of the NEW CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE AT THE PEAK;

also of

THE VARIOUS HOUSE FLAGS

(Designed expressly for the Work)

MAPS OF HONGKONG, JAPAN,

THE

SILK WORM DISTRICTS,

THE

ISLAND OF FORMOSA,

AND OF

THE COAST OF CHINA;

ALSO THE

NEW CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

HONGKONG;

besides other local information and statistics corrected to date of publication, tending to make this Work in every way suitable for Public, Mercantile, and General Offices.

The Directory is published in two forms, Complete at \$1; or with the List of Residents, Post Directories, Maps, &c., at \$3.

Orders for Copies may be sent to the Daily Press Office, or to the following Agents—

Macau.....Messrs. J. P. DA SILVA & Co.

Suzhou.....QUELCH and CAMPBELL.

Amoy.....WILSON, NICHOLLS & Co.

Portuguese.....WILSON, NICHOLLS & Co.

Funchal.....HEDGE & Co.

Ningpo.....KELLY & Co., Shanghai;

Shanghai.....HALL & HOLZ.

Kembla and.....HALL & HOLZ.

River Ports and.....HALL & HOLZ.

Chinkoo and.....HALL & HOLZ and KELLY.

Nanchung and.....HALL & HOLZ, and KELLY.

Tientsin and.....HALL & HOLZ, and KELLY.

Peking.....HALL & HOLZ.

Nagasaki.....THE C. & J. TRADING Co.

Hiogo, Osaka.....THE C. & J. TRADING Co.

Yokohama.....MESSRS. C. W. CRAWFORD & Co.

Manila.....Mr. C. D. MILES, GARCIA & Co.

Singapore.....J. DE LOVAGA & Co.

London.....Strait's Times Office.

London.....Mr. F. ALGEAR, Clement's Lane.

London.....GEO. STREET, 39, Cornhill.

San Francisco.....MESSRS. H. & C. M. FISHER, 21, Merchant's Exchange.

New York.....MESSRS. S. M. PENNINGTON & Co., 37, Park Row.

Hongkong, 2nd January, 1875.

NOTICE.

THE Editorial Department of the Daily Press and Overland Trade Report has this day been placed in the hands of Mr. CHATTERTON WILCOX.

W. H. BELL,

Daily Press Office, Lessor.

Hongkong, January 11th, 1875.

The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, JANUARY 25TH, 1875.

Dr. EITZ, out of the fulness of his Christian charity, while scorning "random statements," has addressed to us "a few words of comfort," thereby hoping to keep coal of fire on our head. He assures us that the exact reverse of all that was stated in Monday's edition of this paper on the subject of Protestant Missions is the fact, and commencing, what he assumes to be the ignorance of "fresh arrival," he proceeds to give an outline of the great work achieved by himself, and coadjutors. The reverend doctor allows to the Roman Catholic missionaries of past times the credit of accomplishing great things; but all that, he says, "is changed now." It is the Catholics, who are resting on their "well-earned laurels," and the Protestants who are really working. We never denied that the Protestant missionaries had done very valuable literary work, nor refused them credit for a certain amount of success. Dr. EITZ has made a mistake in supposing our remarks referred exclusively to China. They applied equally to India and other parts of the East. And, unfortunately for him, the testimony of others is too strong to enable any one to gloss over the real facts, which were in nowise exaggerated. The missions are now comparatively unprofitable; many of the missionaries are neither zealous nor capable. That, in effect, is what was before stated, and we now regret that it is an undeniable fact.

Dr. EITZ first knocks down his Catholic colleague and then stretches out a patronizing hand to him. Of course he is perfectly justified in endeavouring to make good the position of Protestant by a comparison with that of Catholic missionaries, if it will bear it, but it is scarcely fair, when doing so to attempt to make it appear that we have any prejudice against them. We see nothing derogatory in the title of Papist; we have never heard of any strong objection to it on the part of a member of the Romish Church. Adherence to the Pope is the real distinction now between them and the Old Catholics; it is almost the only difference existing between them and the Anglo-Catholics. But the attempt to draw on the ill-will of the Roman Catholic community will, not succeed. We know and appreciate their labours in the spread of Christianity, and though mourning that it, as taught by them, is so much overlaid with man-made dogma, cannot but rejoice in their success. It may be that Catholic missionaries might "do more," but at all events they come out better prepared to fight the battle with the Chinese sophists and scholars than a number of the in-

perienced and half-educated young men sent out by Protestant societies at home. They also exercise greater self-denial, and have a better way of going to work. What says Wong Chin Foo when speaking on the subject? "The Jesuits succeed ten times better than any others (Missionaries), because they fall into the habits of the people, comply with their laws, and thus gain their respect and love, and are better able to perform the work which they attempt." Catholic missionaries, too, do not all sing in the ports and their vicinity, but go hundreds of miles into the interior and labour there, while Protestant missionaries are rarely found any distance from the coast.

That many missionaries who are veritable do-nothings send home highly coloured accounts of the progress of their work is only too well known. It is equally true that several thoroughly enjoy the luxury of indolence, and abundant evidence of this truth is forthcoming on every side. The London Times of a recent date, says—"An English lady who has passed several years in Peking, when her husband was a missionary, writes, 'I and my husband have passed the greatest part of our lives as missionaries in China. We have never found it a post of self-denial, but rather luxurious. We have every comfort. We have the best society—learned Chinese scholars, intelligent American and English merchants and travellers. I fear there is great deal of hunting in the popular notion of the hardships and sacrifice of missionaries." An American paper, commenting on the same subject, remarks that "having once become acclimated, and thoroughly accustomed, to the peculiarities of the climate of these strange countries, the life henceforth of the missionary is, in many cases, simply a career of luxury, of pure idleness, and of such a course of simple do-nothingness as is known nowhere else on the face of the earth. All the teaching, all the labour, all the toil of every sort, is done by native attendants, who have been trained to their work, while the missionary masters not the part simply of the service we offer, but the skill of the men who have had to come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said the error was not so technical as it might seem. He was present in Court when Mr. Hayllar opened his argument by stating that there was an error of law on the part of the judge in his awarding of damages, went into the evidence of the thives. The line had been repaired, and was believe, again in working order.

The Attorney-General pointed out that their Lordships had sat as a jury in this case. Supposing there had been a jury, the present application would have been for a new trial on the ground of misdirection.

The Chief Justice said that was equivalent to saying they had misdirected the jury.

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said he wished to know whether they had met an application for a rehearing.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

The Chief Justice said the other party had a right to say they ought to have a rehearing. He thought it would be better to have a new hearing de novo, because he now had a new set of facts.

Mr. Hayllar said he wished it to be clearly understood that he did not ask for a rehearing—but was again going into the whole case; but for a reconsideration of the evidence and of the law.

The Chief Justice: What you say is "I have nothing to do with the cause itself; I take as concluded facts what are stated in the judgment, and I say that assuming those facts to be correct, I should award them to the Bench you ought to have come to a precisely opposite conclusion."

Mr. Hayllar said that was so.

